

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed January 6, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed together with a *Request for Continued Examination* within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on January 14, 2004; May 11, 2004; February 24, 2005; September 25, 2006; August 22, 2007; February 27, 2008; January 21, 2009 and November 10, 2009. A further IDS is submitted herewith and review and consideration of this IDS is requested.

Claims 1-20, 46-55, 57, 59 and 61 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1-4 are independent. Claims 1, 3 and 6 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. Claims 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57 and 59 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 12, 15-20, 48, 50, 52, 54 and 61 are currently elected, of which claims 1 and 3 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time in conducting a personal interview on January 21, 2010. As explained during the interview, one feature of the present invention is a LCD device wherein a back light unit is directly attached to an insulating film of the LCD device. That is, a lower substrate of the LCD device can be removed and a back light unit directly attached to an insulating film on which semiconductor elements of the LCD device are formed. This results in a thinner, lighter device and is illustrated in Figures 4A-4C of the present application, for example. As further discussed during the interview, the claims of the subject application are amended herewith to clarify the structure of the claimed device wherein a back light unit is in

direct contact with a polarizing plate, which in turn is directly attached to an insulating film of the LCD device by an adhesive.

The Official Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 12, 15-20, 48, 50, 52, 54 and 61 as obvious based on various combinations of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0040645 to Yamazaki; U.S. Patent No. 5,298,768 to Okazaki; U.S. Publication No. 2001/0012089 to Shiraishi, U.S. Patent No. 6,417,899 to Jones, U.S. Patent No. 4,648,691 to Oguchi, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0041348 to Yokoyama, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0130985 to Weindorf, U.S. Patent No. 6,331,381 to Chaudhari, U.S. Patent No. 5,781,263 to Kawagoe, U.S. Patent No. 4,202,607 to Washizuka and U.S. Patent No. 4,536,014 to Boutaleb. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2144.04, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. As noted above, independent claims 1, 3 and 6 have been amended to recite a polarizing plate disposed between the liquid crystal device and the back light unit, the polarizing plate being attached to the insulating film by an adhesive wherein the insulating film is in direct contact with the adhesive, and wherein the polarizing plate is directly attached to the back light unit. For the reasons provided below, Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi, Jones, Oguchi, Yokoyama, Weindorf, Chaudhari, Kawagoe, Washizuka and Boutaleb, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

The Official Action asserts that Yamazaki discloses a liquid crystal device but concedes that Yamazaki “does not disclose a back light ...; a polarizing plate formed over the resin [and] an insulating film adhered to the polarizing plate with an adhesive.” The Official Action asserts that Okazaki discloses “using the light emitting element as a back light for LCD (column 1, lines 5-10)” and further asserts that Jones “discloses (Fig. 4) an internal polarizer (65) is added to Yamazaki’s display,” that “[the] internal polarizer can be placed into Yamazaki’s display in between 117 and 1106” and that “the polarizing plate would be formed over the resin of Okazaki” (Paper No. 20091222, page 3). However, it is respectfully submitted that Yamazaki, Okazaki and Jones, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that the polarizing plate is directly attached to the alleged back light unit. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that Okazaki merely discloses a chip type LED that is not, itself, a back light unit and that Okazaki further applies substrate 16 as a jig (Okazaki, column 6, lines 50 to 52), not a substrate of a back light unit, as the Official Action appears to assert; the rejections are further traversed, at least, for this reason.

U.S. Patent 6,975,369 to Burkholder is submitted in the attached IDS. It is respectfully submitted that Burkholder is evidence of the level of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the present invention. That is, Burkholder was filed December 12, 2002 while the subject application claims a priority date of January 15, 2003. Burkholder discloses the conventional method wherein a back light unit is attached to a polarizing plate that in turn is attached to a substrate of an LCD device. It is clear that Burkholder uses very similar light emitting elements as those of Okazaki and therefore it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention would at best be motivated to combine the light emitting elements of Okazaki into a device such as that disclosed by Burkholder and the subject invention is not realized by such possible combination.

Shiraishi, Oguchi, Yokoyama, Weindorf, Chaudhari, Kawagoe, Washizuka and Boutaleb do not cure the deficiencies in Yamazaki, Okazaki and Jones. The Official Action relies on Shiraishi to allegedly teach that "the first substrate (11) is larger than the second substrate (12) to provide extra length portion (3) to have the terminal portion (31)" (Id.) and relies on Oguchi, Yokoyama, Weindorf, Chaudhari, Kawagoe, Washizuka and Boutaleb to allegedly teach the features of the dependent claims. However, Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi, Jones, Oguchi, Yokoyama, Weindorf, Chaudhari, Kawagoe, Washizuka and Boutaleb, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that the polarizing plate is directly attached to the alleged back light unit. Since Yamazaki, Okazaki, Shiraishi, Jones, Oguchi, Yokoyama, Weindorf, Chaudhari, Kawagoe, Washizuka and Boutaleb do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(a), 1.20(b), 1.20(c), and 1.20(d) (except the Issue Fee) which may be required now or hereafter, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2280.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789